

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ELIZABETH WHITE,
Plaintiff,

v.

ANGELA WRIGHT, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 17-cv-03956-KAW

**ORDER DENYING MOTIONS FOR
RECONSIDERATION**

Re: Dkt. No. 33, 35

Plaintiff Elizabeth White (aka Curry) filed this case against Defendants Angela Wright, Melanie Levorsen, and the Department of Veterans Affairs ("VA"), alleging that the VA wrongfully offset her retirement payments to pay for a debt for which Plaintiff claims she is not responsible. (Compl. at 4, Dkt. No. 1.) Defendants subsequently moved to dismiss the case. (Dkt. No. 16.) On February 1, 2018, the Court held a hearing on Defendants' motion. (Dkt. No. 27.) On February 2, 2018, the Court issued an order granting Defendants' motion to dismiss, finding that the Court lacked jurisdiction over the case per the Veterans' Judicial Review Act of 1988 ("VJRA"). (Dkt. No. 28.)

On February 5, 2018, the Court received a letter from Plaintiff, requesting the court's "review and reconsideration for new trial date." (Dkt. No. 30 at 1.) Plaintiff asserts that Defendants lied about the jurisdictional issue, and again disputed that she had incurred any debt. (*Id.* at 1-2.) The Court denied Plaintiff's request, explaining that it lacked jurisdiction over the case. (Dkt. No. 31 at 1-2.)

On February 5, 2019, the Court received a "Notice of Motion and Motion for Reconsideration." (Dkt. No. 33.) On February 20, 2019, the Court received a second "Notice of Motion and Motion for Reconsideration." (Dkt. No. 35.) In both motions, Plaintiff again asks for


1 reconsideration of the Court's orders, arguing the merits of the case. (Dkt. No. 33 at 8-13; Dkt.
2 No. 35 at 1-2.)

3 The Court DENIES the motions for reconsideration. As an initial matter, Plaintiff has
4 failed to ask for leave to file a motion for reconsideration; Civil Local Rule 7-9 requires that a
5 party be given leave prior to noticing a motion for reconsideration. No leave has been given.
6 Even viewing Plaintiff's request as a motion for leave, the Court denies Plaintiff's motion.
7 Plaintiff's motion still concerns the *merits* of whether the VA wrongfully offset her retirement
8 payments to pay for an alleged debt. The Court cannot review the merits of Plaintiff's claim
9 because, as explained in its February 2, 2018 order, it lacks jurisdiction over this case. (Dkt. No.
10 28.) Therefore, even assuming that Plaintiff has a viable claim, this court is not the correct forum
11 to decide that matter.

12 Because the Court lacks jurisdiction over this case, Plaintiff's motions for reconsideration
13 are denied. The Court will not consider **any** further filings by Plaintiff because the case is **closed**.
14 All future filings will be disregarded by the Court.

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: March 6, 2019

17 
18 KANDIS A. WESTMORE
United States Magistrate Judge